

TO: Robert Axelrod, President  
Members of the APSA Council

FROM: The APSA Annual Meeting Review Committee  
Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University,  
Cristina Beltran, Haverford College  
Marc Blecher, Oberlin College  
Kathleen A. Frankovic, CBS News  
Edward D. Mansfield, University of Pennsylvania  
Walter Mattli, Oxford University  
Elizabeth F. Moulds, California State University, Sacramento  
Alvin B. Tillery, Jr., University of Notre Dame  
Joan C. Tronto, CUNY, Hunter College, Chair

Re: Report to the Council

Date: 23 March 2007

---

### **Executive Summary**

*October 11, 2007 Note: Council decisions **are noted with highlighted text** in this version.*

The APSA Council created the Annual Meeting Review Committee to review the Annual Meeting and to make recommendations for its operation for the next five to ten years. We were charged to consider such issues as the allocation formula for distributing panels, alternative panel formats, participation rules, guidelines for siting future meetings, promoting community within the profession, incorporating new waves of thinking or methods of research, and the use of new technology.

We endeavored to discover how well the Annual Meeting accomplishes its goals by surveying attendees and non-attendees of the 2006 meeting, by requesting comments from all members of the profession, and by consulting with past presidents, program committee chairs, department chairs, and the staff at the national office.

Our basic sense is that the Annual Meeting works well to meet its many goals. The staff manages to organize a very large meeting each year. The levels of no-shows, violators of the participation rules, are very small. In general, the meetings are well run and the attendees, each year more than a third of the total membership of APSA, are generally satisfied. In this report, then, we make some suggestions for change, but in large part, the Annual Meeting works well.

Still, several issues are of some concern. Through the recommendations below, we hope to move the meeting slightly in the direction of being more responsive to new research by changing the allocation rule, to encourage more intellectual exchange at the meetings through changing panel formats and encouraging more opportunities for workgroups and other forms of participation.

Among the recommendations, some are more significant departures from current practices than others. Among the greatest changes are in timing of the meeting, submission deadlines, the allocation formula, participation rules, limitation on the number of panels of any related group, changing panel formats, discussants for poster sessions, encouraging more informal networks for participants, providing powerpoint technology, and provision for compliance with carbon neutrality.

Here is a summary of our findings:

- 1. The Annual Meeting is a complex event that fulfills many different ends.***
- 2. There is general satisfaction with the Annual Meeting.***
- 3. Increasing formalization of specialization characterizes the discipline.***
- 4. The size of the Annual Meeting is acceptable.***
- 5. Funding opportunities from universities greatly affect the ability of members to attend the Annual Meeting.***
- 6. Many members of the Association, attendees and non-attendees alike, wish for a greater opportunity not only to present their own work but to engage in more in-depth and meaningful intellectual dialogue at the meetings***

Here is a summary of our recommendations:

- 1. Non-discriminatory siting. APSA should continue its current practice which permits us to terminate an agreement that abridges the civil rights of APSA members.***
- 2. Union Preference Policy. APSA should adopt a slightly more rigorous policy to prefer union hotels and providers for its meetings.***
- 3. Timing. APSA should consider moving the meeting occasionally, and on an experimental basis, away from Labor Day weekend.***
- 4. It should be a goal in siting and timing the meetings to keep costs as low as possible.***
- 5. The Submission deadline should be moved back to Dec 15. The preliminary program should be published in July rather than in June.***
- 6. Fairness of acceptance/rejection: Annual Meeting or Program Committee should ensure that an up-to-date and accurate website will direct submitters to learn more about reasons why their proposals were accepted/rejected.***
- 7. APSA should insist that all related groups send out a public and open call for papers and panels.***
- 8. Participation in the Annual Meeting is limited to two (2) appearances on sessions organized by the APSA Program Committee, Organized Sections, and Related Groups. An appearance may take the form of sole author of a paper,***

*co-author of a paper, roundtable presenter, discussant, or chair. A person may appear on the program only once as the sole or co-author of a paper unless one of his/her single-authored papers is on a panel organized by Division 9: Teaching and Learning in Political Science or Division 10: Undergraduate Education.*

*Appearances in workshops, poster sessions, evening sessions, and panels sponsored or co-sponsored by the Annual Meeting program chair(s) do not count against the participation limit.*

*If a person is appearing during a panel session as a paper giver, roundtable presenter, or discussant, serving as chair of the same session does not count as an additional appearance.*

- 9. Size. The meeting is at its optimal size; it should only grow slightly as membership grows.*
- 10. Allocation formula. We propose a change in these steps to make rejection rates a part of the formula.*
- 11. Make Allocation formula available to membership.*
- 12. Technology: APSA should make powerpoint projectors available to those who need them. If necessary, a technology surcharge should be added to the cost of registration.*
- 13. APSA should begin to try new technologies on a pilot basis: podcasts, vodcasts, teleconferencing.*
- 14. Posters and Papers. Divisions that present posters should also assign a discussant for posters.*
- 15. Panel formats should provide for greater discussion and participation.*
- 16. Innovation in Presenting Substantive Ideas in Panels. The committee recommends that Program Co-Chairs be encouraged, in addition/in lieu of a theme, to focus on political events and to promote or showcase research that bridges the subfield boundaries*
- 17. Working Groups, Networks, and Other Quasi-Formal Groups should be encouraged.*
- 18. PROceedings. APSA should more strongly encourage posting of papers, presentations, and Discussion Leaders' Comments.*
- 19. Carbon neutrality. APSA should provide a voluntary option for members to make their attendance at meetings carbon neutral. The mechanism for doing so can be implemented by the staff.*
- 20. Oversight. The Annual Meeting Committee should serve as an oversight and advisory body to the staff of APSA in running and organizing the Annual Meeting.*

We submit this report to the Council for its consideration.

We thank Barbara Burrell of the Northern Illinois University Public Opinion Organization for conducting the surveys.

We wish to thank profusely the staff at the national office of APSA for their ongoing assistance and counsel in our work. They have provided data, answered our

questions, overseen the surveys, arranged our meetings, maintained our website. Rob Hauck has been especially invaluable, as have been Christina Marmor, Sean Twombly, Michael Brintnall, and others.

The Members of the Annual Meeting Review Committee:

- Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University, [beck.9@osu.edu](mailto:beck.9@osu.edu)
- Cristina Beltran, Haverford College [cbeltran@haverford.edu](mailto:cbeltran@haverford.edu)
- Marc Blecher, Oberlin College [marc.blecher@oberlin.edu](mailto:marc.blecher@oberlin.edu)
- Kathleen A. Frankovic, CBS News [kaf@cbsnews.com](mailto:kaf@cbsnews.com)
- Edward D. Mansfield, University of Pennsylvania [emansfie@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:emansfie@sas.upenn.edu)
- Walter Mattli, Oxford University [walter.mattli@st-johns.oxford.ac.uk](mailto:walter.mattli@st-johns.oxford.ac.uk)
- Elizabeth F. Moulds, California State University, Sacramento [mouldsef@csus.edu](mailto:mouldsef@csus.edu)
- Alvin B. Tillery, Jr., University of Notre Dame [alvin.tillery.2@nd.edu](mailto:alvin.tillery.2@nd.edu)
- Joan C. Tronto, CUNY, Hunter College, Chair [jtronto@hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:jtronto@hunter.cuny.edu)

### **The Committee's Work**

The APSA Council approved the creation of The Annual Meeting Review Committee at its meeting in September 2005 and charged the committee to “address the specific strengths and weaknesses of the annual meeting’s current structure and practices and anticipate trends that could influence the format, organization, rules, and cost of the annual meeting over the next 5-10 years. Among the subjects the review committee will consider, but not be limited to, are: (1) the allocation formula for distributing panels among program divisions and related groups; (2) alternatives to conventional panel and roundtable formats; (3) program participation rules; (4) guidelines for siting future meetings; (5) promoting community within the profession through scholarly meetings; (6) the meeting’s capacity to incorporate new waves of thinking or methods of research; and (7) adapting new technologies to meeting presentations and operations.”

The Committee began its work by gathering data and defining the scope of its concerns. We met in Washington in March, 2006, and at that time decided to conduct a survey after the 2006 meeting. We reported to the Council in April 2006. We met again in September 2006 and reported again to the Council. We then met in January 2007, and agreed to the positions outlined in this report. We have spent the last months resolving some remaining issues and preparing this final report.

The Committee relied heavily upon data provided by the APSA national office staff. We reviewed membership data and trends, participation in the Annual Meeting over time, program allocations to divisions and related groups since 1995, the budget for the Annual Meeting, the standard meeting contracts, the meeting sites from 1990-2015, the number of exhibiting companies by year, acceptance rates for division. We examined data collected by the national office about attendance at various events at the Annual Meeting. These documents are attached as Appendix A.

We also reached out broadly to members in order to solicit their views. We conducted a web-based survey of all attendees of the 2006 Annual Meeting and a sample of non-attendees of the 2006 Meeting. The reports of these surveys are attached as Appendix B and Appendix C. We solicited comments from past program chairs, from department chairs, and from current members of the Annual Meeting Committee. We also sent a general call for comments to all members via the monthly news bulletin. We received well over 300 messages from individual members and from individuals representing sections and related groups within the Association. We believe that this is the broadest solicitation of the membership about the Annual Meeting that has ever been conducted.

Overall, we find that the Annual Meeting functions relatively well. Nevertheless, anticipating future changes and cognizant of some room for improvement, we offer 20 recommendations to the Council for its consideration. To frame our reasoning, we begin by reporting some findings and then proceed to the recommendations and their rationales.

## Findings

*1. The Annual Meeting is a complex event that fulfills many different ends.* The Annual Meeting fulfills a large number of different needs for different members of the Association. Among these are:

**Scholarly goals:** The prime purpose of the meeting is to offer scholars a chance to present their scholarly work to their peers and to learn about the scholarly work of others. Such scholarly work may be useful to academic and non-academic political scientists. Further, this goal is important both to the most junior scholars who are presenting for the first time and to senior scholars. It is not a surprise that for over ninety per cent of participants who responded to the questionnaire, scholarship was an “important” or “very important” reason to attend the meeting. Excluding those who have not yet given a paper, 84% of attendees expect usually to publish their papers.

**Pedagogical goals:** a second key purpose is to provide for academic political scientists to learn about substantive developments in areas of their teaching expertise and to share with others their advancements in pedagogy. The Council in the past has taken special note of the importance of this goal, e.g., in expanding the participation opportunities for those who participate on teaching panels.

**Networking goals:** As with participants at all forms of professional meetings, the survey and other evidence suggest that political scientists derive much value in attendance from the chance to see their colleagues, meet new colleagues, and reinforce professional networks.

**Professional development goals:** APSA uses the Annual Meeting as an opportunity for new members of the profession to learn about the profession and for established members of the profession to continue to develop professionally. Some examples of professional development at the Annual Meeting are the short courses, special programs for graduate students, and the working groups.

**Promoting community in the profession:** The Annual Meeting promotes community in the profession by providing the opportunity for deeper contacts to develop among political scientists from around the globe. For example, the Annual Meeting affords the opportunity for scores of related groups to meet and to pursue common interests. The Annual Meeting Program Committee, by choosing a common theme, tries to foster community across sub-disciplines. In recent years, the Council has been eager to increase participation by international scholars at the APSA Annual Meeting. By providing an opportunity for all political scientists to meet together and hear and speak to the entire discipline, the Annual Meeting promotes community.

**Association-specific goals** The Annual Meeting also provides one of the few opportunities for the diverse members of the profession to participate in governance of the Association. Various committees meet at the Annual Meeting, as do the governing bodies of most sections. Some panel sections are organized to serve as an opportunity for committees of APSA to present findings that serve this goal. The Annual Meeting also creates a focal point to showcase the contributions of political scientists to media.

Revenue from the Annual Meeting contributes significantly to the financial wellbeing of the Association, providing revenue that can be used to subsidize other important activities.

**Vocational goals** The Annual Meeting provides the largest single venue in the profession for potential employers to meet and interview political scientists.

**Business goals** Through an exhibitions hall, the Annual Meeting provides opportunities for its members to learn about businesses of special interest to its members. For example, the exhibition hall provides political scientists with an opportunity to learn about new publications in their field, about fellowship opportunities, and to meet with potential publishers.

Not all of these goals are important to each member of the Association, and their importance may change across a member's career. Nevertheless, all of these goals are important at every Annual Meeting. In short, the Annual Meeting fulfills myriad needs.

In recent years, the Council has often acted to further certain goals of the Association at the Annual Meeting. In reviewing the practices of the Annual Meeting, the Committee explored these goals and how well they are being met.

2. *There is general satisfaction with the Annual Meeting.* There is general satisfaction with the way that the Annual Meeting functions. We make a number of suggestions throughout this report, but in general it is important to realize that that members seem generally satisfied with the structure of the meeting. The survey results suggest that members seem able to fulfill their needs well through attendance at the Annual Meeting. Non-attendees are, predictably, split about the value of attendance.

3. *Increasing formalization of specialization characterizes the discipline.* The Annual Meeting, like the Association itself, is undergoing a gradual transformation in the direction of great importance for Organized Sections. There are currently 36 organized sections, which are responsible for organizing the vast majority of the 47 divisions in the Annual Meeting Program. A large number of attendees (31%) reported that they attended a business meeting for their sections or groups, and while this percentage may be exaggerated because of a response bias in favor of the more involved members, it nonetheless shows how important the sections are as a site for political scientists to work together.

While the sections play a vital role for the Association, not all members see the sections as centrally important to their role as political scientists. Only 54% of APSA members are members of any section, and 34

% join two or more sections. So while sections have become an important way to organize members' connections to APSA, they are not the only way to do so.

Not surprisingly, some members voice dissatisfaction with the decentralization of the discipline. The Annual Meeting thus must strike a balance between supporting

increasingly specialized work and finding a way to provide common bonds throughout the discipline.

4. ***The size of the Annual Meeting is acceptable.*** Although around a third of participants find the Annual Meeting too large, given its multiple goals, most members are willing to agree that the size of the meeting is “just about right.” Thus, we will not recommend expanding or shrinking the size of the meeting except for some growth as membership increases. Nevertheless, many of our recommendations speak to the desirability of having more in-depth discussions in panels. Thus, any growth in the size of the meeting is likely to come from increasing the number of attendees who do not have formal roles on the program. Communicating how these activities can contribute to members’ intellectual and professional development, and convincing funding departments, colleges and universities of their value, remains a challenge to be faced.

5. ***Funding opportunities from universities greatly affect the ability of members to attend the Annual Meeting***

Financing plays an important role in attendance and APSA is dependent on the institutions that provide funding for its meetings’ high attendance.

Nearly half the attendees (48%) reported being fully funded. Another third (31%) were partly funded. Only one in five attendees received no support. But for those who did receive support, it made a difference. When those who did get funded (either in part or fully) were asked if they would have attended the APSA annual meetings without funding, half of those who had been funded (either partly or in full), said they would NOT have come.

Among non-attendees, one third said a change in cost (presumably a lower cost) would impact their attendance. But there does not seem to be much difference in the reported pattern of financial support from their institutions and the institutions of meeting attendees. See Table 1.

Table 1. Funding Availability for Attendees and Non-Attendees

FUNDING AVAILABLE...	ATTENDEES	NON-ATTENDEES
Only if paper-giver	37%	37%
If listed on the program	28%	16%
For any kind of participation	18%	15%
Even if not a participant	17%	13%
Not at all	NA	20%

6. ***Many members of the Association, attendees and non-attendees alike, wish for a greater opportunity not only to present their own work but to engage in more in-depth and meaningful intellectual dialogue at the meetings.*** Both in the surveys and in the large numbers of comments sent to us, the one wish that emerged was for more

substantive and meaningful opportunities for genuine dialogue. There is a remarkable asymmetry in how many people are willing to present their research and how relatively sparse are the audiences for panels. Some members even suggested that we reward people for attending panels.

## Recommendations

In light of these findings, we make the following twenty recommendations. In order to organize the recommendations, we proceed through the “life cycle” of a meeting from its siting through the process of submissions, the actual meeting, and the aftermath of the meeting.

### *Siting and Timing of Meetings.*

**1. Non-discriminatory siting. APSA should continue its current practice which permits us to terminate an agreement that abridges the civil rights of APSA members. [Council decision: Approved; The Council also asked the Committee on the Status of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and the Transgendered in the Profession to elaborate on their original proposal.]**

Rationale:

The current language in the termination section of our standard contract reads:

10.02

APSA has selected [name of city] as a site of its annual meeting in light of the city’s anti-discrimination record. APSA reserves the right of termination of this agreement, without penalty or liability, if the government of the city in which the hotel is located establishes or enforces laws that, in the estimation of APSA, abridge the civil rights of any APSA member on the basis of gender, race, color, national origin, sexual orientation, marital status, physical handicap, disability, or religion.

While some members and groups within APSA have asked us to go further in affirming particular policies, this language gives us sufficient latitude to protect the Association’s interests and to safeguard the rights and dignity of members. Moreover, we felt any larger change in this policy was a matter for the Council, not for us.

**2. Union Preference Policy. APSA should adopt a slightly more rigorous policy to prefer union hotels and providers for its meetings. [Council decision: Approved]**

a. Those responsible for negotiating and administering hotel and service contracts for the APSA Annual Meeting and any other meeting organized by the national Association shall make every effort to give preference to a suitable unionized hotel and/or service provider, cost considerations being otherwise equal.

b. Further, the standard contract language should be amended as indicated in bold below:

10.01. Performance

Neither party (hotel and APSA) shall be responsible for any failure of performance due to acts of God, war, government regulation, disaster, labor disputes and strikes, civil disorder, curtailment of transportation facilities, shortage of commodities or supplies to be furnished by the [name of hotel], or other emergencies making it inadvisable, illegal or impossible to provide the facilities or to hold the meeting in the hotel or city as originally planned. It is provided that this agreement may be terminated for any one or more of such reasons by written notice from one party to the other **ADD: “without penalty or liability.”**

[a] the Hotel shall provide APSA written notification of pending labor contract terminations or changes.

Rationale:

a. Although the Committee has received requests that we take more aggressive pro-labor stances, and despite the sympathy of a majority of members surveyed for such positions, as a professional association our position can only extend as far as the best interest of the profession. The current language makes it clear that “labor friendly” policies are preferable. Moreover, we felt any greater change in this policy was a matter for the Council, not for us.

b. The Association’s contract already includes force majeure clauses that permit the Association to terminate a contract in the event of a labor dispute. We have suggested a slight change in that language.

**3. Timing. APSA should consider moving the meeting occasionally, and on an experimental basis, away from Labor Day weekend. Some meetings (if popular, as often as every other year) should be scheduled up to two weeks earlier or later than Labor Day weekend. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Attendees and non-attendees described two serious forms of conflicts that occur when the meetings are scheduled for Labor Day weekend. First, given the holiday’s status as the end of summer, it seems to violate a sense of family friendliness to hold the meeting over Labor Day weekend. Parents whose children are beginning school or college often have especially serious family duties during this time. Second, especially at institutions that are teaching-intensive, the conflict between the meeting and the beginning of semester puts faculty into a very difficult situation of missing first classes or missing a major opportunity for scholarly activity. However, one reason to keep the meeting on Labor Day weekend is that almost any other weekend in the year will cost members more to attend. Moving the meeting back into the fall may cause conflicts with religious holidays. Implementing this recommendation will require the staff to investigate these possibilities carefully.

**4. Cost. It should be a goal in siting and timing the meetings to keep costs as low as possible. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: APSA's stated goal is to include and to increase participation in the Association by faculty from non-Ph.D. granting institutions. Such institutions are less likely to provide their faculty with research budgets. Thus, the cost of attendance may be much greater and more burdensome for those members.

### *Constructing the Program*

#### Submissions Policies

**5. The Submission deadline should be moved back to Dec 15. The preliminary program should be published in July rather than in June. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: One problem with the current meeting is that sometimes papers are not written, and ones that are written are not of as high a quality as they could be. One possible reason for this problem is that the time from submission of a proposal until the paper will be written is too long. The solution is to give scholars more time to organize panels and to think about their papers. If the submission deadline is closer to when the final work will be submitted, we can expect that proposals will more accurately reflect the work to be done. We can also expect that the preliminary program, which will have to be published somewhat later, will be more accurate. Thus, the division chairs will be better able to make solid decisions about which proposals to accept, and those planning to attend the meeting will have a more accurate sense of what the sessions will be.

**6. Fairness of acceptance/rejection: Annual Meeting or Program Committee should ensure than an up-to-date and accurate website will direct submitters to learn more about reasons why their proposals were accepted/rejected. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Findings from the surveys indicated that those whose proposals were accepted thought the process fair, those whose proposals were rejected found the process unfair. The balance is to try to find a way to make the process somewhat more transparent, but not to burden division chairs.

We considered, but rejected, the idea of anonymous submissions. From the survey results we learned that members are unwilling to submit complete papers for review, which is the only way that anonymous submissions become feasible. Anonymous submissions of only abstracts do not seem to provide the division chairs with enough information upon which to make a judgment about whether a paper will be completed and about its likely quality.

While it is too difficult to ask division chairs to write individual notes to each submitter about why a proposal was rejected, nevertheless some feedback will be useful. Creating a website that explains the usual reasons that division chairs rejected proposals will not be too burdensome for division chairs, too personally directed at a particular rejection, and will provide some guidance to submitters for their future work.

**7. APSA should insist that all related groups send out a public and open call for papers and panels. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Related groups benefit from being able to hold panels at the Annual Meeting. They should therefore be open to all participants at the Association's meetings and should thus issue an equally public call for papers and panels.

**8. Participation in the Annual Meeting is limited to two (2) appearances on sessions organized by the APSA Program Committee, Organized Sections, and Related Groups. An appearance may take the form of sole author of a paper, co-author of a paper, roundtable presenter, discussant, or chair. A person may appear on the program only once as the sole or co-author of a paper unless one of his/her single-authored papers is on a panel organized by Division 9: Teaching and Learning in Political Science or Division 10: Undergraduate Education.**

**Appearances in workshops, poster sessions, evening sessions, and panels sponsored or co-sponsored by the Annual Meeting program chair(s) do not count against the participation limit.**

**If a person is appearing during a panel session as a paper giver, roundtable presenter, or discussant, serving as chair of the same session does not count as an additional appearance. [Council decision: Rejected]**

Rationale: As the Association tries to broaden its reach to more political scientists, as the submission deadline change is likely to generate more proposals, and as the formula for allocation will change some current patterns of acceptance, (see recommendation 10), participation on the program will become a resource that is differently allocated. In order to make this resource as widely available as possible, participation should be limited to one opportunity to present a paper of original research per meeting. Co-authors should not be able to appear on additional panels. They may of course have their names appear on their co-authored work, but they will not be listed in the program.

On the other hand, the Program Committee often has difficulties attracting participants for theme, service, and teaching panels given the desire of members to be able to present their other research. Therefore, exempting these kinds of panels from the more restrictive participation rule is desirable. Similarly, given the difficulty to find panel chairs, the rule exempting panel chairing to count as a separate appearance should remain.

*Organizing The Meeting*

**9. Size. The meeting is at its optimal size; it should only grow slightly as membership grows. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: The current size of the Annual Meeting was adopted by the Council by pegging the number of sessions to the 1990 number and expanding it as membership increased. The Committee received a number of calls to increase or decrease the size of

the meeting. We rejected changes that would cut or increase the meeting's size dramatically because we were not persuaded that the current size is inappropriate. While some might wish for a more intimate scholarly experience, there are ways to create a "meeting within the meeting" to effect this end. For the most part, the surveys suggest, people are satisfied with the meeting's size.

As international membership grows, the ratio of members to attendees might change. Thus, the idea that the growth of the meeting should be pegged to the growth in membership should be monitored by the Annual Meeting Review Committee.

**10. Allocation formula.** The current allocation formula consists of six steps and is enclosed as Appendix C. **We propose a change in these steps to make rejection rates a formal and more prominent part of the formula. [Council decision: Approved]**

The new allocation rules, thus, would be:

A. Determining the Overall NUMBER OF PANELS at the meeting:

1. The base size of the program committee panels is 730 panels (the 2005 number). The base will be adjusted in future up or down by the percent increase or decrease in APSA membership since 2005.
2. The program co-chairs are entitled to organize a number of panel equal to 5% of the total number of panels organized by the program committee divisions.
3. The related groups panels may equal no more than 20% of the total official program. The size is calculated by measuring related group panel attendance as a percentage of total attendance in the previous year.
4. The total number of panels organized by standing and ad hoc committees of the Association shall not exceed 2% of the program committee panels.

B. Determining the Allocation of panels at the meeting:

1. Regular program allocation:

- a. Ninety percent of the program committee panels will be allocated on the basis of weighted attendance figures.
- b. The remaining 10% of program committee panels would be distributed based upon acceptance/rejection rates. Divisions whose acceptance rates are below the overall acceptance rate shall share in the distribution of the remaining panels in proportion to the percentage of rejections for that division. The rejection rates will be averaged over two years.
- c. Other previous compensatory decisions, e.g., to increase the number of teaching panels, or comparative panels, are revoked.

Rationale: a and b: Attendance is an important measure of the interest of members in the topics and papers considered in a panel. Since about half of the attendees at a meeting give papers, though, the effect of using attendance as the sole measure for allocating panels over time became path-dependent.

A variety of members and groups have expressed the view, which the Committee endorses, that it is desirable if the program can more quickly reflect new fields of research and forms of work in political science. While it might be possible to “game the system” (though less likely to do so for two years in a row), the Committee expects that in developing fields where more new work is being done, the rejection rates will be higher. Thus, this mechanism is meant to be compensatory. If many scholars in new fields are competing for fewer places on the program, the overall effect is to offer all attendees a less dynamic portrait of the discipline.

The two year average is intended to keep anomalous events in one year from distorting the program.

Rationale: c: The new allocation rule should compensate for any needs to give substantive advantage to some divisions or topics over others.

## 2. Related Panel Allocations:

- a. Every related group that requests to be a part of the program will receive one panel.
- b. Other allocations of related group panels will be based on weighted attendance figures.
- c. The total number of panels allocated to any related group shall not exceed the number of panels allocated to the average program committee division (which in 2006 was 14).

Rationale:

Point a: continues current practice.

Point b: Because APSA does not collect data on acceptance/rejection rates for Related Groups, this same formula cannot be applied to them.

Point c: The advantage of having Related Panels is to add to the richness and diversity of the meeting. . If a related organization is so large, it should consider becoming a more formal part of the Association. Thus, this rule is proposed to encourage large related groups to become more fully integrated into the APSA.

## 11. APSA will make the allocation formula available to its membership. [Council decision: Approved]

Rationale: Although the allocation formula is complex, it should also be available for members.

*The Meeting*

**12. Technology: APSA should make powerpoint projectors available to those who need them. If necessary, a technology surcharge should be added to the cost of registration. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: The power point issue was a consistent complaint by members who attended the annual meeting. Members were also willing to pay a fee to enhance technology at the meetings. The details of how this technology can be provided in the most cost-efficient manner will need to be resolved by the staff, perhaps working with the Annual Meeting Committee.

**13. APSA should begin to try new technologies on a pilot basis: podcasts, vodcasts, teleconferencing. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Especially as more international members join the Association, alternative means of sharing the scholarly work done at the meeting may become more feasible in the next several years. Many of the non-attendees surveyed were eager to receive podcasts. A pilot program will allow the Association to assess whether and how quickly to move in these new directions.

**14. Posters and Papers. Divisions that present posters should also assign a discussant for posters. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Members reported on the survey that the mix of papers and posters seems good. Nevertheless, poster sessions may work better for some subfields than for others. One way to make the poster sessions more productive and more attractive to the poster presenters will be to include a discussant, ideally a senior member of the subfield who is able to comment upon the diverse posters present. One member of the committee was not certain about the practicality of this recommendation. This issue should be monitored by the Annual Meeting Committee.

**15. Panel formats should provide for greater discussion and participation. [Council decision: Approved]**

- a. APSA should strongly work to prevent too many papers crowding on a panel. We recommend as a rule, that there be three or four papers
- b. We encourage divisions and related groups to consider moving to a Discussion-leader model in which the discussion-leader, rather than the authors, would present the papers. Such a model should be required if there are more than 4 papers on a panel.
- c. Panels should be organized to encourage greater audience participation. Panel chairs should insist that a half hour at minimum be left for discussion.
- d. Other innovative ways to organize sessions should be encouraged if they permit greater substantive interaction among scholars.
- e. . One way to implement such a change, for example, might be to single out a specific set of time slots — perhaps one day — for such a format, to be followed by some sort of survey to assess the results. Nevertheless, These ideas should be implemented and monitored by the Annual Meeting Committee.

Rationale:

a, b, c, d, e: There were a substantial number of complaints that panels are too large, and that there is really too little opportunity for genuine exchange of ideas on panels. This frustration explains in part why attendance at panels is so low and why each attendee on average attends so few panels (the modal number of panels attendees reported attending was 3-5; there are 14 regular panel time slots at the meeting. The average panel attendance for the whole conference is ###)

We suspect that what is happening now, at least in part, is that division chairs, understanding the shortage of slots, try to accommodate as many papers on the same topic as possible and that they also guard against dropouts from the time they structure the panel to the final, official version of it – and then even to avoid the possibility that a panel will be wrecked by some who cancel out during the summer. To some extent, changing the submission deadline may solve some of the problem of extra-“insurance” papers; so while many on the committee believed that the norm should be three papers, we believe that this change might best be implemented gradually.

In 2006, counting division panels and counting each paper only by its first author, there were 100 panels with 1-3 papers; 306 with 4; 174 with 5, and 3 with 6.

b: The committee received some complaints that the role of the discussant should be abolished. We have moved in a different direction and suggest that the discussant’s role be substantially upgraded to the role of discussion leader. The discussion leader would take on the primary responsibility for presenting the papers and offer commentary on them and the panel theme. In this way, work can be presented in a more succinct way, and a more in-depth exchange and discussion can ensue. Having the discussant present the paper would also create an incentive for authors to get their work to the discussants in a timely way and in a fairly polished form.

One disadvantage of this model is that sometimes panel members wish to present their own work for other reasons; e.g., if they are on the job market and wish to demonstrate their presentation skills. We do not believe that this rule should be enforced rigidly, but we do hope to move the norm of participation more in the direction of an informed seminar.

**16. Innovation in Presenting Substantive Ideas in Panels. The committee recommends that Program Co-Chairs be encouraged, in addition/in lieu of a theme, to focus on political events and to promote or showcase research that bridges the subfield boundaries. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Both attendees and non-attendees voiced some concern that politics and work that bridges sub-disciplines are less prominent than they would like to see at the Annual Meeting. Sometimes the program theme is able to encourage such work, sometimes it is not. Some members even suggested that the theme be abolished to create more opportunities for different kinds of interaction. There was also enthusiasm from the committee about the possibility of encouraging a small number of major (and cross-

subfield) sessions on hot political issues of the day. This is a way to respond to the sometimes heard complaint that the program could profitably be more engaged with contemporary politics.

**17. Working Groups, Networks, and Other Quasi-Formal Groups should be encouraged:**

- a. Division chairs and the program co-chairs might do more to encourage working groups.**
- b. Existing networks of scholars can be encouraged to apply to use space for a meeting, especially during the lunch hour period from noon until 2 pm**
- c. Other forms of sessions might be organized to encourage new networks to develop. Applications to the program chairs for cross-cutting, informal sessions, somewhat akin to the “methodologies café” would be useful in promoting exchanges among scholars who do not already know one another well.**
- d. Participation in working groups should be listed on the official program.**

**[Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale:

a, b, c, d: Working groups and networks provide an opportunity to make the large meeting “smaller” by creating a cadre of interested scholars who are able to work together. Allowing existing and new networks to emerge is a way to foster intellectual community at the meeting.

*The Meeting in Larger Contexts*

**18. PROceedings. APSA should more strongly encourage posting of papers, presentations, and Discussion Leaders’ Comments. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Not everyone wants to put an unfinished or unpolished paper on the web. On the other hand, in order for the meetings to have their widest intellectual impact, such publication is a benefit to the community of scholars.

Other forms of documents might also be useful to include in the PROceedings. For those who would prefer to contribute, e.g., their power point slides, this should be an option.

For those who will serve as Discussion Leaders, i.e., as more serious discussants, then they should have the opportunity to post their comments. This will also create a venue to recognize the contribution of discussants as serious scholarly work.

**19. Carbon neutrality. “Becoming carbon neutral is usually achieved by implementing renewable energy projects that offset the amount of carbon dioxide emissions, such as planting trees which absorb CO<sub>2</sub>.” (Webster’s New Millennium Dictionary of the English Language). APSA should provide a voluntary option for members to make their attendance at meetings carbon neutral. The mechanism for doing so can be implemented by the staff. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: Many organizations, including FIFA, have recognized the environmental impact of their meetings. Without committing APSA to an organizational position, as we were urged to do by some, it would be useful for members to be able to make a judgment about their travel and its environmental impact and to act accordingly.

This step is parallel to the support for good labor practices recommended earlier, but like that recommendation, it does not commit the Association to a political position on the matter.

**20. Oversight. The Annual Meeting Committee should serve as an oversight and advisory body to the staff of APSA in running and organizing the Annual Meeting. [Council decision: Approved]**

Rationale: The Annual Meeting Committee cannot be involved in the day-to-day operations of the Annual Meeting. Nonetheless, the committee might be called upon to serve as a sounding board for important concerns and ideas by the staff. For example, the staff are eager to consider using a more sophisticated radio frequency tracking system, rather than sending people with counters, to determine attendance. Whether this idea would be acceptable to the membership goes beyond the staff's purview. Siting a meeting in a particular city needs to be negotiated within days, but having some sense of the committee's reactions would help staff make these decisions more efficaciously.